

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/828,575	Applicant(s) CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-16,18 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-16,18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>7/21/2008</u> . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-4,6-16,18-19 pending in this application.
2. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 4/14/2008.
3. Claims 1,7,16 have been amended [4/14/08].
4. Claims 5,17 have been cancelled 4/14/2008].

Double Patenting

5. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

6. Claims 1-4,6-16,18-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-19 of co-pending US application No. **10/595,379** This is a double patenting rejection. It is further noted that claim 1 limitations in the instant

Art Unit: 2166

application is the combination of claim 1 and claim 5 of co-pending US application

No. **10/595,379**, also claims 2 through 4, 6 through 15, 18-19 are exactly same as claims 2 through 4, 6 through 15, 18-19 of co-pending US application No. 10/595,379, further, instant application claim 16 limitation is the combination of claim 16 and 17 of co-pending US application No. 10/595,379.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-16, 18-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-19 of co-pending US application No. 10/595,379

For example:

Instant application - claim	co-pending US application No. 10/595,379 -
-----------------------------	--

claim	
-------	--

Claim 1	claim 1,5
---------	-----------

Claim 2	claim 2
---------	---------

Claim 3	claim 3
---------	---------

Claim 4	claim 4
---------	---------

Claim 6	claim 6
---------	---------

Claim 7	claim 7
---------	---------

Claim 8	claim 8
---------	---------

Claim 9	claim 9
---------	---------

Claim 10	claim 10
----------	----------

Claim 11	claim 11
----------	----------

Claim 12	claim 12
----------	----------

Claim 13	claim 13
----------	----------

Claim 14	claim 14
Claim 15	claim 15
Claim 16	claim 16,17
Claim 18	claim 18
Claim 19	claim 19

Examiner notes that the content of the claims on record are identical to the content of claims in the co-pending US application No.10/595,379.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim have been considered, however examiner issued "Double patent" rejection based on the co-pending application No. 10/595,379 as stated above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

Srirama Channavajjala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2166.